IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL, CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT **PETITION NO.1330 OF 2006**

Chandrakant Anant Rane & Anr..Petitioners
Vs.
Slum Rehabilitation Authority
& Ors. ...Respondents

Mr.Manish Mistry i/b. M.P. Vashi & Associates for
the petitioners
Mr. G.D. Utangale, for respondent No.1.
Mr. Milind More, AGP for Respondent Nos. 2 and 6.
Mr. M.S. Rane, for Respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

CORAM: **F.I. REBELLO &**
MRS.V.K.TAHILRAMANI, JJ.
DATE: 20th July,2006

P.C.

. LOI has been granted on 4th June, 2005. The name of petitioner No..1 is included. The LOI is in favour of respondent No.3, who have appointed respondent No.4 who are the developers. Once that be the case we are not inclined to interfere in the exercise of our extra ordinary jurisdiction. It has been the experience of this Court that these are petitions supported by rival builders and are taking the valuable time of the Court. The petitioners, if are eligible would be entitled to 225 sq.ft. free of charge in the SRA scheme. If it it is the case of the petitioner No.2, that her name is not included in the Annexure she will either have to represent by preferring an appeal or if her name is not considered

by filing a claim before the Appropriate authority.

2. The petitioners contend that they have received a communication from the Housing Department that if they have support of 70% then their case will be considered. We are unable to comprehend as to how such letter could be issued without first terminating the LOI granted in favour of respondent No.3 society.

3. For the aforesaid reasons no cause for interference. Petition rejected.

(F.I. REBELLO, J)

(MRS.V.K.TAHILRAMANI, J).